

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims have been amended as set forth above. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of any of the cancelled claims in any forthcoming continuation application(s). Applicants believe that the claims are in condition for allowance.

I. Examiner Interview Dated May 12, 2009

An interview was held on May 12, 2009. An agreement as to allowability was not reached. Applicants believe that an agreement was reached that the current changes push prosecution forward.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 22 and 24-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,181,781 issued to Porter et al. (hereinafter “Porter”) in view of “Ring Central Products: PhoneWorks 2002” (hereinafter “PhoneWorks”). Applicants respectfully disagree. For simplicity of explanation, applicants will first discuss the advantageous features associated with the PUID as set forth in the specification.

As background, and not for limiting the claims in any manner, the specification recites an example as follows:

The subscriber’s personal information is stored in notification server 304. **Notification server 304 generates a personal unique identifier (PUID) to identify the subscriber such that the PUID correlates to a corresponding identifier.** *Specification* at page 6, lines 12-14 (emphasis added).

Notification server 304 **provides a link between the identifier associated with the event and the PUID associated with the subscriber.** The telephone carrier uses the identifier, such as the subscriber’s phone number, to identify an event. **Notification server 304 uses the PUID to identify the subscriber.** Notification server 304 is not aware of the subscriber associated with the identifier. When an event occurs at voice mail switch 308, **notification server 304 correlates the identifier associated with the event to the corresponding PUID and then forwards the event to the PUID.** Likewise, the telephone carrier does not store any PUID information. Thus, notification server 304 can bridge voice mail switch 308 to web service interface 302 **by mapping the subscriber’s telephone**

number to the corresponding PUID. Specification at page 7, lines 20-30 (emphasis added).

Notification server 304 has a set of subscriber-defined settings that determine where the alerts are sent. *For example, the subscriber can elect to receive alerts at a computer in the form of an instant message that appears as a pop-up window on the computer screen when the subscriber is on-line. If the subscriber is off-line, the subscriber can have the alerts forwarded to a voice mailbox that is accessed by a different number than the phone number associated with the voice mailbox where the message was left. Alternatively, the alerts can be deposited in the subscriber's e-mail inbox in the form of a text message. The alerts can be delivered to any destination by any communication method designated by the subscriber at web service interface 302. Specification at page 7, lines 11-19 (emphasis added).*

The telephone carrier and web service interface 302 each recognize the subscriber via different string values, *i.e., a phone number and a PUID*. This feature *provides the subscriber with flexibility in customizing the alerts service because notification server 304 can map one or more phone numbers to one or more PUIDs. For example, the subscriber can receive alerts at one location for events occurring at many different voice mail switches. Likewise, a subscriber can receive the same alert at more than one location. Furthermore, multiple subscribers can be notified of the same event. For example, an entire family can be simultaneously notified of voice mail messages left at their residential line. Specification at page 8, lines 1-9 (emphasis added).*

Independent claim 22 recites “generating a personal unique identifier (PUID) separate and independent of the received mailbox identifier and the received subscriber profile information, wherein the PUID provides a first mapping and a second mapping, wherein the first mapping maps the mailbox identifier to the PUID, wherein the second mapping maps the subscriber profile information to the PUID, wherein the PUID is an intermediary between the mailbox identifier and the subscriber profile information via the first and second mapping to disassociate the mailbox identifier from being a link to the subscriber profile information.” “receiving, on the notification server, a message event having a mailbox identifier,” “matching, on the notification server, the received mailbox identifier to one of the stored mailbox identifiers of the mailbox registration information,” “identifying the generated PUID from the first mapping,” in combination with “identifying the subscriber profile information from the second mapping.”

The above combination of features is not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references. The current Office Action acknowledges that the PUID is distinct from Porter's mailbox number. The prior Office Action argued that Porter teaches a user profile that reads on the PUID. Porter actually taught a "subscriber profile." *Porter* at col. 2, lines 47-49. Independent claim 22 was amended to clearly distinguish the subscriber profile information from the PUID in the response to the prior Office Action. Now, the current Office Action argues that the email address may be a PUID as it will be present in the user profile and will uniquely identify a user, and is mapped to a mailbox identifier. Applicants respectfully disagree. Independent claim 22 has been amended to clarify that the PUID is generated by the notification server. The PUID has also been clarified to indicate that it is generated separate and independent of the received mailbox identifier and the received subscriber profile information. The PUID has been further clarified to recite that the PUID includes the first and second mapping. The PUID is an intermediary between the mailbox identifier and the subscriber profile information via the first and second mapping to disassociate the mailbox identifier from being a link to the subscriber profile information. Applicants assert that there is no way of broadly reading the email address of Porter, the user profile of Porter, the extension number of Porter or the password of Porter or any other portion of Porter as including the PUID as defined to include the functionality as defined. With regard to PhoneWorks, PhoneWorks does not remedy the lack of teaching in Porter. PhoneWorks teaches allowing fax, e-mail, and voice mail messages to come together in one common "in-box." PhoneWorks teaches that the voicemail system supports an unlimited number of voice mailboxes. PhoneWorks also teaches notification and forwarding rules. Yet, PhoneWorks does not teach how any of these features occur. The Office Action speculates as to how the functionality of PhoneWorks occurs. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in PhoneWorks of a PUID and/or the features and functionality of the PUID as indicated in the claim. Accordingly, applicants assert that independent claim 22 is allowable.

Independent claim 26 recites "generating a personal unique identifier (PUID) separate from the received mailbox identifier and the received subscriber profile information, wherein the PUID provides a first mapping and a second mapping, wherein the first mapping maps the

mailbox identifier to the PUID, wherein the second mapping maps the subscriber profile information to the PUID, wherein the PUID is an intermediary between the mailbox identifier and the subscriber profile information via the first and second mapping to disassociate the mailbox identifier from being a link to the subscriber profile information,” “receiving, on the notification server, a message event having a mailbox identifier,” “matching, on the notification server, the received mailbox identifier to one of the stored mailbox identifiers of the mailbox registration information,” “identifying the generated PUID from the first mapping,” in combination with “identifying the subscriber profile information from the second mapping.”

The above combination of features is not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references. The current Office Action acknowledges that the PUID is distinct from Porter’s mailbox number. The prior Office Action argued that Porter teaches a user profile that reads on the PUID. Porter actually taught a “subscriber profile.” Porter at col. 2, lines 47-49. Now, the current Office Action argues that the email address may be a PUID as it will be present in the user profile and will uniquely identify a user, and is mapped to a mailbox identifier. Applicants respectfully disagree. Independent claim 26 has been amended to clarify that the PUID is generated by the notification server. The PUID has also been clarified to indicate that it is generated separate from the received mailbox identifier and the received subscriber profile information. The PUID has been further clarified to recite that the PUID includes the first and second mapping. The PUID is an intermediary between the mailbox identifier and the subscriber profile information via the first and second mapping to disassociate the mailbox identifier from being a link to the subscriber profile information. Applicants assert that there is no way of broadly reading the email address of Porter, the user profile of Porter, the extension number of Porter or the password of Porter or any other portion of Porter as including the PUID as defined to include the functionality as defined. With regard to PhoneWorks, PhoneWorks does not remedy the lack of teaching in Porter. PhoneWorks teaches allowing fax, e-mail, and voice mail messages to come together in one common “in-box.” PhoneWorks teaches that the voicemail system supports an unlimited number of voice mailboxes. PhoneWorks also teaches notification and forwarding rules. Yet, PhoneWorks does not teach how any of these features occur. The Office Action speculates as to how the functionality of

PhoneWorks occurs. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in PhoneWorks of a PUID and/or the features and functionality of the PUID as indicated in the claim. Accordingly, applicants assert that independent claim 26 is allowable.

Independent claim 34 recites “generating a ***first personal unique identifier (fPUID)*** ***separate from*** the received mailbox identifier and the received first subscriber profile information, wherein the fPUID provides a ***first mapping*** and a ***second mapping***, wherein the first mapping maps the mailbox identifier to the fPUID, wherein the second mapping maps the first subscriber profile information to the fPUID, ***wherein the fPUID is an intermediary between the mailbox identifier and the first subscriber profile information via the first and second mapping to disassociate the mailbox identifier from being a link to the first subscriber profile information***”, “generating a ***second personal unique identifier (sPUID)*** ***separate from*** the received mailbox identifier and the received second subscriber profile information, wherein the sPUID provides a ***first mapping*** and a ***second mapping***, wherein the first mapping maps the mailbox identifier to the sPUID, wherein the second mapping maps the second subscriber profile information to the sPUID, ***wherein the sPUID is an intermediary between the mailbox identifier and the second subscriber profile information via the first and second mapping to disassociate the mailbox identifier from being a link to the second subscriber profile information***”, “receiving, on the notification server, a message event having a mailbox identifier”, “matching, on the notification server, the received mailbox identifier to the stored mailbox identifier”, “***identify the fPUID from the first mapping of the fPUID and identify the sPUID from the first mapping of the sPUID***”, “***identify the first subscriber profile information from the second mapping of the fPUID***”, in combination with “***identify the second subscriber profile information from the second mapping of the sPUID***.”

The above combination of features is not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references. The current Office Action acknowledges that the PUID is distinct from Porter’s mailbox number. The prior Office Action argued that Porter teaches a user profile that reads on the PUID. Porter actually taught a “subscriber profile.” *Porter* at col. 2, lines 47-49. Now, the current Office Action argues that the ***email address*** may be a PUID as it will be present in the user profile and will uniquely identify a user, and is mapped to a mailbox identifier. Applicants

respectfully disagree. Independent claim 34 has been amended to clarify that the first and second PUID is generated by the notification server. The first and second PUID has also been clarified to indicate that it is generated separate from the received mailbox identifier and the received subscriber profile information. The first and second PUID has been further clarified to recite that the PUID includes the first and second mapping. The PUID is an intermediary between the mailbox identifier and the subscriber profile information via the first and second mapping to disassociate the mailbox identifier from being a link to the subscriber profile information.

Applicants assert that there is no way of broadly reading the email address of Porter, the user profile of Porter, the extension number of Porter or the password of Porter or any other portion of Porter as including the PUID as defined to include the functionality as defined. With regard to PhoneWorks, PhoneWorks does not remedy the lack of teaching in Porter. PhoneWorks teaches allowing fax, e-mail, and voice mail messages to come together in one common "in-box."

PhoneWorks teaches that the voicemail system supports an unlimited number of voice mailboxes. PhoneWorks also teaches notification and forwarding rules. Yet, PhoneWorks does not teach how any of these features occur. The Office Action speculates as to how the functionality of PhoneWorks occurs. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in PhoneWorks of a PUID and/or the features and functionality of the PUID as indicated in the claim. Accordingly, applicants assert that independent claim 34 is allowable.

With regard to the dependent claims, the dependent claims include features that are not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references. Furthermore, those claims ultimately depend from the independent claims set forth above. As such, they should be found allowable for at least those same reasons.

III. Request for Reconsideration

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicants at the telephone number provided below.

App. No. 10/679,819
Amendment Dated: June 15, 2009
Reply to Office Action of March 16, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



RYAN T. GRACE

Registration No. 52,956

Direct Dial: 402.344.3000

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P. O. Box 2903

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903

612.332.5300

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE